REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22, 24, 26-28, 30, 31, and 33-52 are pending, with claims 1, 10, 13, 19, 28, and 31 being independent. Claims 1, 8-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 26-28, 30, 31, 33, 34, and 36 have been amended. Claims 3, 5, 7, 11, 14, 21, 23, 25, 29, and 32 have been canceled. Claims 41-52 have been added. Support for the new claims and the present amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 5, line 6 to page 9, line 35. Now new matter is introduced by the present amendment.

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Vitali A. Korobov for the telephone interviews conducted with the Applicant's representative, Babak Akhlaghi, on June 22 and 27, 2006. During the interviews, the rejection of claim 1 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,374,402 ("Schmeidler") in further view of the U.S. Patent Number 7,017,189 ("DeMello") and the rejection of claim 13 as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent Number 6,009,462 ("Birrell") were discussed. In the following paragraphs, Applicant first addresses the rejection of claims 1, 10, 19, and 28, and then the rejection of claims 13 and 31.

A. The rejection of claims 1, 10, 19, and 28.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12, 19-22, 24-26, 28, 30 and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmeidler in further view of DeMello. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner Korobov for suggesting that the incorporation of the features of claim 7 into claim 1 overcomes the Schmeidler and DeMello references. Accordingly, Applicant has incorporated the features of claim 7 into the claim 1. In particular, amended claim 1 recites a method of processing a data stream with a computer system that includes, among other features, "temporarily overriding the default rendering process identified in the registry of the computer includes changing the registry of the computer such that the default rendering process identified in the registry of the computer and associated with the content type of data in the data stream is replaced with the particular rendering process if the browser application is determined to have been invoked within the application environment of the internet service provider."

Applicant respectfully asserts that Schmeidler and DeMello, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest "temporarily overriding the default rendering process identified in the registry of the computer includes changing the registry of the computer such that the default rendering process identified in the registry of the computer and associated with the content type of data in the data stream is replaced with the particular rendering process if the browser application is determined to have been invoked within the application environment of the internet service provider," as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, none of the other references cited in the Office Action describe or suggest the above recited feature.

During the interviews, the Examiner Korobov also indicated that claim 1 may be in a condition for allowance if the other nine new references that the Examiner Korobov e-mailed to the Applicant's representative on June 22, 2006, also fail to describe or suggest the above recited feature. The nine references include U.S. Patent Number 6,167,567 ("Chiles"), U.S. Patent Number 6,314,501 ("Gulick"), U.S. Publication Number 2003/0202010 ("Kerby"), U.S. Publication Number 2002/0166038 ("MacLeod 1"), and U.S. Patent Number 6,886,171 ("MacLeod 2"), U.S. Publication Number 2005/0210412 ("Matthews"), U.S. Patent Number 6,212,574 ("O'Rourke"), U.S. Patent Number 6,292,824 ("Siksa"), and U.S. Publication Number 2003/0037178 ("Vessey"). First, Applicant respectfully asserts Kerby, MacLeod 1, and MacLeod 2 fail to qualify as a prior art under § 102(e). Second, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remaining six references do not describe or suggest the above recited feature of claim 1.

(1) Kerby, MacLeod 1, and MacLeod 2 fail to qualify as a prior art under § 102(e).

The present application claims priority from U.S. Application Serial No. 60/237,697, filed on October 5, 2000. Specification at page 1, lines 3-4. Thus, the pending claims in the present application are entitled to at least the October 5, 2000, priority date.

In contrast, Kerby, MacLeod 1, and MacLeod 2 were all filed after the October 5, 2000, priority date. In particular, Kerby was filed on April 26, 2002, and MacLeod 1 and MacLeod 2 were both filed on February 20, 2001, which is after the October 5, 2000, priority date of the

present application. As such, Kerby, MacLeod 1, and MacLeod 2 were not filed before the present application, and they therefore fail to qualify as a prior art under § 102(e).

(2) The remaining six references fail to describe or suggest the above recited feature of claim 1.

Applicant has studied references Chiles, Gulick, Matthews, O'Rourke, Siksa, and Vessey, and respectfully submits that none of those references, either alone or in combination, describe or suggest "temporarily overriding the default rendering process identified in the registry of the computer includes changing the registry of the computer such that the default rendering process identified in the registry of the computer and associated with the content type of data in the data stream is replaced with the particular rendering process if the browser application is determined to have been invoked within the application environment of the internet service provider," as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, along with its dependent claims.

Similar to claim 1, claims 10, 19, and 28 also have been amended to include the above recited feature. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 10, 19, and 28, along with their dependent claims, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

B. The rejection of claims 13 and 31.

Claims 13-19 and 31-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Birrell. Applicant has amended independent claims 13 and 31 to obviate their rejections.

As amended, claim 13 recites a method that includes calling a data stream using a browser running on a computer system. The method also includes detecting an original Multipurpose Internet Mail Extension (MIME) type of the data stream called by the browser and changing the original MIME type of the data stream to a different MIME type. The original MIME type associates the data stream with a first rendering process identified in a registry of the

computer system and the different MIME type associates the data stream with a second rendering process identified in the registry of the computer system. The method also includes handling the data stream with the second rendering process based on the different MIME type of the data stream.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 because Birrell fails to describe or suggest at least "changing the original MIME type of the data stream to a different MIME type, wherein the original MIME type associates the data stream with a first rendering process identified in a registry of the computer system and the different MIME type associates the data stream with a second rendering process identified in the registry of the computer system" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 13.

Instead, as pointed out during the interview, Birrell discloses a method of downloading mail messages in a distributed computer system. Abstract. The portion of Birrell discussed during the interview and relied upon in the Office Action actually describes a "low-bandwidth" filtering method for minimizing the amount of data that are sent from the mail service to the client machine in a "low-bandwidth" network. Col. 12, lines 45-51. The "low-bandwidth" filtering approach described in this portion proposes to hold back attached and embedded multi-media files that are delivered with messages, and to replace those files with hot-links that require manual selection to inspire delivery and rendering of corresponding files. As such, this portion nor any other portion of Birrell, describes or suggests "changing the original MIME type of the data stream to a different MIME type, wherein the original MIME type associates the data stream with a first rendering process identified in a registry of the computer system and the different MIME type associates the data stream with a second rendering process identified in the registry of the computer system" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 13.

The difference between the technology described in Birrell and the subject matter of claim 13 is perhaps best illustrated with an example. If we assume, *arguendo*, the attached file in Birrell is equivalent to the data stream described in claim 13 and also assume, *arguendo*, the attached file has an original MIME type, once the attached file passes through the low-bandwidth filter, both the attached file and its MIME type change (e.g., the file is replaced by a hot-link).

As such, the data stream is completely changed. In contrast, in claim 13, only the MIME type associated with the data stream changes and the data stream is not altered. Thus, the subject matter of claim 13 enables the different MIME type to act as a surrogate for the first MIME type when consulting the registry of the computer system and identifying a rendering process.

To illustrate the differences between the present application and Birrell further, one example in the specification notes:

> **the MIME filter changes the MIME type of the data stream returned to URLMON to a predetermined MIME type (step 610) for which no media player or a dummy media player has been registered. As a result, when the browser detects the altered MIME type in the data stream, the browser will initiate either no media player or an instance of this dummy media player, as appropriate (step 620). Then, to complete the data sink, the modified data stream is routed to this dummy media player, which receives the data stream and either discards the data stream or performs some trivial or background function on the data stream. Specification at page 9, lines 18-25.**

As shown above, Birrell's "low-bandwidth" filtering approach is completely different than "changing the original MIME type of the data stream to a different MIME type, wherein the original MIME type associates the data stream with a first rendering process identified in a registry of the computer system and the different MIME type associates the data stream with a second rendering process identified in the registry of the computer system" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 13. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the other references describe or suggest the above recited features.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 13 along with its dependent claims

Claim 31 has been amended to recite features similar to that of claim 13 in the context of a computer readable medium. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 31, along with its dependent claims, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 13.

New Claims

Claims 41-52 depend, variously, from independent claims 1, 13, 19, and 31. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 41-52 are allowable at least because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 13, 19, and 31.

Conclusion

Again, Applicant would like to thank Examiner Korobov for his kind attention regarding this matter and his help in moving this case forward.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The $150 fee for the additional claims is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/30/2006

W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40353201.doc